

THE RICHMOND DISPATCH.

BY THE DISPATCH COMPANY.

The DAILY DISPATCH is delivered to subscribers at FIFTY CENTS per week, payable to the carrier weekly. Mailed at \$6 per annum in advance. Single copies, 10 cents. The WEEKLY DISPATCH at \$1 per annum, or \$1 for six months.

Subscriptions in all cases payable in advance, and no paper continued after the expiration of the time paid for. Send post-office money order, check, or registered letter. Currency sent by mail will be at the risk of the sender. Subscribers wishing their post-office changed must give their old as well as their new post-office. Sample copies free.

ADVERTISING RATES.

HALF INCH OR LESS.
1 time.....1.00
2 times.....1.50
3 times.....2.00
4 times.....2.50
5 times.....3.00
6 times.....3.50
7 times.....4.00
8 times.....4.50
9 times.....5.00
10 times.....5.50
11 times.....6.00
12 times.....6.50
13 times.....7.00
14 times.....7.50
15 times.....8.00
16 times.....8.50
17 times.....9.00
18 times.....9.50
19 times.....10.00
20 times.....10.50
21 times.....11.00
22 times.....11.50
23 times.....12.00
24 times.....12.50
25 times.....13.00
26 times.....13.50
27 times.....14.00
28 times.....14.50
29 times.....15.00
30 times.....15.50
31 times.....16.00
32 times.....16.50
33 times.....17.00
34 times.....17.50
35 times.....18.00
36 times.....18.50
37 times.....19.00
38 times.....19.50
39 times.....20.00
40 times.....20.50
41 times.....21.00
42 times.....21.50
43 times.....22.00
44 times.....22.50
45 times.....23.00
46 times.....23.50
47 times.....24.00
48 times.....24.50
49 times.....25.00
50 times.....25.50
51 times.....26.00
52 times.....26.50
53 times.....27.00
54 times.....27.50
55 times.....28.00
56 times.....28.50
57 times.....29.00
58 times.....29.50
59 times.....30.00
60 times.....30.50
61 times.....31.00
62 times.....31.50
63 times.....32.00
64 times.....32.50
65 times.....33.00
66 times.....33.50
67 times.....34.00
68 times.....34.50
69 times.....35.00
70 times.....35.50
71 times.....36.00
72 times.....36.50
73 times.....37.00
74 times.....37.50
75 times.....38.00
76 times.....38.50
77 times.....39.00
78 times.....39.50
79 times.....40.00
80 times.....40.50
81 times.....41.00
82 times.....41.50
83 times.....42.00
84 times.....42.50
85 times.....43.00
86 times.....43.50
87 times.....44.00
88 times.....44.50
89 times.....45.00
90 times.....45.50
91 times.....46.00
92 times.....46.50
93 times.....47.00
94 times.....47.50
95 times.....48.00
96 times.....48.50
97 times.....49.00
98 times.....49.50
99 times.....50.00
100 times.....50.50

Card of rates for more space furnished on application.

All letters and telegrams must be addressed to THE DISPATCH COMPANY.

Reflected communications will not be returned.

SUNDAY.....JANUARY 24, 1886.

The Vashon Case.

On the 16th instant, in speaking of the decision of the Supreme Court of Appeals in the VASHON case, we said:

"This decision does not attack the validity of the contract between the State and her creditors so far as the Legislature had the power to contract. The bonds issued in 1871, as well as the McCulloch bonds, are as good as ever. So are the coupons of those bonds. The only difference is that the coupons cannot now be lawfully received for that portion of taxes levied for the support of the public schools. The law of Virginia already provides that they shall not be received for that purpose, and the law is constitutional."

[The Virginia issue changed the word "constitutional" to "unconstitutional." The right word was used by us.]

Speaking of the above paragraph, our Lynchburg contemporary said a few days afterwards:

"We cannot, therefore, assent to the construction which the Dispatch puts upon the decision."

On the 20th we insisted that our language as quoted was an absolutely correct statement of what had been decided by the court.

On the 22d the Virginia returned to the subject in an article more than two columns long; but as it fails to point out a single avowal of ours that is not true, we might well drop the subject. Let us examine these avowals:

1. "This decision does not attack the validity of the contract between the State and her creditors so far as the Legislature had the power to contract." Isn't that statement absolutely accurate? The Virginia did not deny that it is.

2. "The bonds issued in 1871, as well as the McCulloch bonds, are as good as ever. So are the coupons of those bonds." Isn't that statement a correct one? Will any lawyer say that those bonds or these coupons are not now as good as they were before the decision was rendered? Surely the brokers and bankers know what the decision was.

3. "The only difference is that the coupons cannot now be lawfully received for that portion of taxes levied for the support of the public schools." That is all the difference.

4. "The law of Virginia already provides that they shall not be received for that purpose, and the law is constitutional." This statement is absolutely true.

We ask our Lynchburg contemporary to "tussle" with those points. They are the ones he assailed.

Nevertheless, as the Virginia manifests an admirable spirit in its articles, we will notice one or two of its utterances. The long article which we have mentioned seems to have been written with the intention of showing that the Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia would if a case involving that question were brought before that tribunal decide the funding act of 1871 to be unconstitutional. We cannot for one moment entertain that belief. But as we said nothing on that point in the paragraph from which the Virginia dissented in its first article, and as our negative prediction would be worth just as much as, and no more than, the Virginia's affirmative prediction, we will not touch that point. We confine ourselves, and we ask the Virginia to confine itself, to the points at issue. We have no objection, however, to a "tussle" with the following:

"If, therefore, 'school taxes' are embraced in the 'all taxes, debts, and demands' mentioned in the funding bill as payable in coupons, then that part of the funding bill must, of course, be unconstitutional and void. We would like to see the Dispatch tussle with that 'contentation according,' as Tony Lumpkin would say."

We beg leave to reply that "school taxes" are embraced in the "all taxes, debts, and demands" mentioned in the funding bill as payable in coupons, then that part of the funding bill must, of course, be unconstitutional and void, not in its entirety, but so far only as it attempts to make coupons receivable for school taxes. And this last is in substance exactly what the Supreme Court of Appeals decided in the VASHON case.

We will add here that the vice of the Virginia's argument lies in the assumption that all of a law is unconstitutional if part of it is. In other words, we hold that the funding act of 1871 and the law under which VASHON's suit was defeated are both constitutional. The latter is constitutional in all its parts. The former was passed constitutional in all of its features, but in 1884 it was repealed so far as the school taxes were concerned. Coupons were receivable for "all taxes" from 1871 to 1884. In 1884 a new law was passed excepting school taxes. These are now payable only in money; but all the rest of the act of 1871 is

still in full force. There is no question of constitutionality here, Brother MAYE.

Silver Lunatics.

Mr. H. H. GIBBS, ex-governor (or president) of the Bank of England, and Mr. HENRY R. GREENE, the present governor of that most celebrated bank in the world, are bimetalists. So says a telegram in yesterday's Dispatch.

And the former gentleman has said that he was confident that the United States Congress would not demonetize silver nor stop its coinage. He attributes the financial troubles of the world in a measure to the unsettled condition of the currency question in many if not all countries. He holds that bimetalism is necessary to agriculture and trade.

In Germany, too, the silverites seem to be growing rapidly in numbers.

What will the goldites say as to these most distinguished financiers in the world? When a governor and an ex-governor of the Bank of England declare that silver constitutes a necessary part of the currency of the world, they must mean something by it; and the little fellows who have been making Wall street hideous with their cries against silver ought to hide their diminished heads. But we know what these gentlemen will say—namely, that Mr. GIBBS and Mr. GREENE are British enemies of these United States and urging us on to our own ruin and to their benefit. But who will credit such an aspersion?

Pass Him Around.

The Independent Republican papers are already giving BOUTELLE the benefit of free advertising. The New York Times opens with the following "pull":

"The fiery, untamed Bouteille, of Bangor, endeavored yesterday to stir the blood of his fellow-artisans once more with the old controversy over more with the public schools. The law of Virginia already provides that they shall not be received for that purpose, and the law is constitutional."

[The Virginia issue changed the word "constitutional" to "unconstitutional." The right word was used by us.]

Speaking of the above paragraph, our Lynchburg contemporary said a few days afterwards:

"We cannot, therefore, assent to the construction which the Dispatch puts upon the decision."

On the 20th we insisted that our language as quoted was an absolutely correct statement of what had been decided by the court.

On the 22d the Virginia returned to the subject in an article more than two columns long; but as it fails to point out a single avowal of ours that is not true, we might well drop the subject. Let us examine these avowals:

1. "This decision does not attack the validity of the contract between the State and her creditors so far as the Legislature had the power to contract." Isn't that statement absolutely accurate? The Virginia did not deny that it is.

2. "The bonds issued in 1871, as well as the McCulloch bonds, are as good as ever. So are the coupons of those bonds." Isn't that statement a correct one? Will any lawyer say that those bonds or these coupons are not now as good as they were before the decision was rendered? Surely the brokers and bankers know what the decision was.

3. "The only difference is that the coupons cannot now be lawfully received for that portion of taxes levied for the support of the public schools." That is all the difference.

4. "The law of Virginia already provides that they shall not be received for that purpose, and the law is constitutional." This statement is absolutely true.

We ask our Lynchburg contemporary to "tussle" with those points. They are the ones he assailed.

Nevertheless, as the Virginia manifests an admirable spirit in its articles, we will notice one or two of its utterances. The long article which we have mentioned seems to have been written with the intention of showing that the Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia would if a case involving that question were brought before that tribunal decide the funding act of 1871 to be unconstitutional. We cannot for one moment entertain that belief. But as we said nothing on that point in the paragraph from which the Virginia dissented in its first article, and as our negative prediction would be worth just as much as, and no more than, the Virginia's affirmative prediction, we will not touch that point. We confine ourselves, and we ask the Virginia to confine itself, to the points at issue. We have no objection, however, to a "tussle" with the following:

"If, therefore, 'school taxes' are embraced in the 'all taxes, debts, and demands' mentioned in the funding bill as payable in coupons, then that part of the funding bill must, of course, be unconstitutional and void. We would like to see the Dispatch tussle with that 'contentation according,' as Tony Lumpkin would say."

We beg leave to reply that "school taxes" are embraced in the "all taxes, debts, and demands" mentioned in the funding bill as payable in coupons, then that part of the funding bill must, of course, be unconstitutional and void, not in its entirety, but so far only as it attempts to make coupons receivable for school taxes. And this last is in substance exactly what the Supreme Court of Appeals decided in the VASHON case.

We will add here that the vice of the Virginia's argument lies in the assumption that all of a law is unconstitutional if part of it is. In other words, we hold that the funding act of 1871 and the law under which VASHON's suit was defeated are both constitutional. The latter is constitutional in all its parts. The former was passed constitutional in all of its features, but in 1884 it was repealed so far as the school taxes were concerned. Coupons were receivable for "all taxes" from 1871 to 1884. In 1884 a new law was passed excepting school taxes. These are now payable only in money; but all the rest of the act of 1871 is

still in full force. There is no question of constitutionality here, Brother MAYE.

Silver Lunatics.

Mr. H. H. GIBBS, ex-governor (or president) of the Bank of England, and Mr. HENRY R. GREENE, the present governor of that most celebrated bank in the world, are bimetalists. So says a telegram in yesterday's Dispatch.

And the former gentleman has said that he was confident that the United States Congress would not demonetize silver nor stop its coinage. He attributes the financial troubles of the world in a measure to the unsettled condition of the currency question in many if not all countries. He holds that bimetalism is necessary to agriculture and trade.

In Germany, too, the silverites seem to be growing rapidly in numbers.

What will the goldites say as to these most distinguished financiers in the world? When a governor and an ex-governor of the Bank of England declare that silver constitutes a necessary part of the currency of the world, they must mean something by it; and the little fellows who have been making Wall street hideous with their cries against silver ought to hide their diminished heads. But we know what these gentlemen will say—namely, that Mr. GIBBS and Mr. GREENE are British enemies of these United States and urging us on to our own ruin and to their benefit. But who will credit such an aspersion?

Pass Him Around.

The Independent Republican papers are already giving BOUTELLE the benefit of free advertising. The New York Times opens with the following "pull":

"The fiery, untamed Bouteille, of Bangor, endeavored yesterday to stir the blood of his fellow-artisans once more with the old controversy over more with the public schools. The law of Virginia already provides that they shall not be received for that purpose, and the law is constitutional."

[The Virginia issue changed the word "constitutional" to "unconstitutional." The right word was used by us.]

Speaking of the above paragraph, our Lynchburg contemporary said a few days afterwards:

"We cannot, therefore, assent to the construction which the Dispatch puts upon the decision."

On the 20th we insisted that our language as quoted was an absolutely correct statement of what had been decided by the court.

On the 22d the Virginia returned to the subject in an article more than two columns long; but as it fails to point out a single avowal of ours that is not true, we might well drop the subject. Let us examine these avowals:

1. "This decision does not attack the validity of the contract between the State and her creditors so far as the Legislature had the power to contract." Isn't that statement absolutely accurate? The Virginia did not deny that it is.

2. "The bonds issued in 1871, as well as the McCulloch bonds, are as good as ever. So are the coupons of those bonds." Isn't that statement a correct one? Will any lawyer say that those bonds or these coupons are not now as good as they were before the decision was rendered? Surely the brokers and bankers know what the decision was.

3. "The only difference is that the coupons cannot now be lawfully received for that portion of taxes levied for the support of the public schools." That is all the difference.

4. "The law of Virginia already provides that they shall not be received for that purpose, and the law is constitutional." This statement is absolutely true.

We ask our Lynchburg contemporary to "tussle" with those points. They are the ones he assailed.

Nevertheless, as the Virginia manifests an admirable spirit in its articles, we will notice one or two of its utterances. The long article which we have mentioned seems to have been written with the intention of showing that the Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia would if a case involving that question were brought before that tribunal decide the funding act of 1871 to be unconstitutional. We cannot for one moment entertain that belief. But as we said nothing on that point in the paragraph from which the Virginia dissented in its first article, and as our negative prediction would be worth just as much as, and no more than, the Virginia's affirmative prediction, we will not touch that point. We confine ourselves, and we ask the Virginia to confine itself, to the points at issue. We have no objection, however, to a "tussle" with the following:

"If, therefore, 'school taxes' are embraced in the 'all taxes, debts, and demands' mentioned in the funding bill as payable in coupons, then that part of the funding bill must, of course, be unconstitutional and void. We would like to see the Dispatch tussle with that 'contentation according,' as Tony Lumpkin would say."

We beg leave to reply that "school taxes" are embraced in the "all taxes, debts, and demands" mentioned in the funding bill as payable in coupons, then that part of the funding bill must, of course, be unconstitutional and void, not in its entirety, but so far only as it attempts to make coupons receivable for school taxes. And this last is in substance exactly what the Supreme Court of Appeals decided in the VASHON case.

We will add here that the vice of the Virginia's argument lies in the assumption that all of a law is unconstitutional if part of it is. In other words, we hold that the funding act of 1871 and the law under which VASHON's suit was defeated are both constitutional. The latter is constitutional in all its parts. The former was passed constitutional in all of its features, but in 1884 it was repealed so far as the school taxes were concerned. Coupons were receivable for "all taxes" from 1871 to 1884. In 1884 a new law was passed excepting school taxes. These are now payable only in money; but all the rest of the act of 1871 is

still in full force. There is no question of constitutionality here, Brother MAYE.

Silver Lunatics.

Mr. H. H. GIBBS, ex-governor (or president) of the Bank of England, and Mr. HENRY R. GREENE, the present governor of that most celebrated bank in the world, are bimetalists. So says a telegram in yesterday's Dispatch.

And the former gentleman has said that he was confident that the United States Congress would not demonetize silver nor stop its coinage. He attributes the financial troubles of the world in a measure to the unsettled condition of the currency question in many if not all countries. He holds that bimetalism is necessary to agriculture and trade.

In Germany, too, the silverites seem to be growing rapidly in numbers.

What will the goldites say as to these most distinguished financiers in the world? When a governor and an ex-governor of the Bank of England declare that silver constitutes a necessary part of the currency of the world, they must mean something by it; and the little fellows who have been making Wall street hideous with their cries against silver ought to hide their diminished heads. But we know what these gentlemen will say—namely, that Mr. GIBBS and Mr. GREENE are British enemies of these United States and urging us on to our own ruin and to their benefit. But who will credit such an aspersion?

Pass Him Around.

The Independent Republican papers are already giving BOUTELLE the benefit of free advertising. The New York Times opens with the following "pull":

"The fiery, untamed Bouteille, of Bangor, endeavored yesterday to stir the blood of his fellow-artisans once more with the old controversy over more with the public schools. The law of Virginia already provides that they shall not be received for that purpose, and the law is constitutional."

[The Virginia issue changed the word "constitutional" to "unconstitutional." The right word was used by us.]

Speaking of the above paragraph, our Lynchburg contemporary said a few days afterwards:

"We cannot, therefore, assent to the construction which the Dispatch puts upon the decision."

On the 20th we insisted that our language as quoted was an absolutely correct statement of what had been decided by the court.

On the 22d the Virginia returned to the subject in an article more than two columns long; but as it fails to point out a single avowal of ours that is not true, we might well drop the subject. Let us examine these avowals:

1. "This decision does not attack the validity of the contract between the State and her creditors so far as the Legislature had the power to contract." Isn't that statement absolutely accurate? The Virginia did not deny that it is.

2. "The bonds issued in 1871, as well as the McCulloch bonds, are as good as ever. So are the coupons of those bonds." Isn't that statement a correct one? Will any lawyer say that those bonds or these coupons are not now as good as they were before the decision was rendered? Surely the brokers and bankers know what the decision was.

3. "The only difference is that the coupons cannot now be lawfully received for that portion of taxes levied for the support of the public schools." That is all the difference.

4. "The law of Virginia already provides that they shall not be received for that purpose, and the law is constitutional." This statement is absolutely true.

We ask our Lynchburg contemporary to "tussle" with those points. They are the ones he assailed.

Nevertheless, as the Virginia manifests an admirable spirit in its articles, we will notice one or two of its utterances. The long article which we have mentioned seems to have been written with the intention of showing that the Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia would if a case involving that question were brought before that tribunal decide the funding act of 1871 to be unconstitutional. We cannot for one moment entertain that belief. But as we said nothing on that point in the paragraph from which the Virginia dissented in its first article, and as our negative prediction would be worth just as much as, and no more than, the Virginia's affirmative prediction, we will not touch that point. We confine ourselves, and we ask the Virginia to confine itself, to the points at issue. We have no objection, however, to a "tussle" with the following:

"If, therefore, 'school taxes' are embraced in the 'all taxes, debts, and demands' mentioned in the funding bill as payable in coupons, then that part of the funding bill must, of course, be unconstitutional and void. We would like to see the Dispatch tussle with that 'contentation according,' as Tony Lumpkin would say."

We beg leave to reply that "school taxes" are embraced in the "all taxes, debts, and demands" mentioned in the funding bill as payable in coupons, then that part of the funding bill must, of course, be unconstitutional and void, not in its entirety, but so far only as it attempts to make coupons receivable for school taxes. And this last is in substance exactly what the Supreme Court of Appeals decided in the VASHON case.

We will add here that the vice of the Virginia's argument lies in the assumption that all of a law is unconstitutional if part of it is. In other words, we hold that the funding act of 1871 and the law under which VASHON's suit was defeated are both constitutional. The latter is constitutional in all its parts. The former was passed constitutional in all of its features, but in 1884 it was repealed so far as the school taxes were concerned. Coupons were receivable for "all taxes" from 1871 to 1884. In 1884 a new law was passed excepting school taxes. These are now payable only in money; but all the rest of the act of 1871 is

still in full force. There is no question of constitutionality here, Brother MAYE.

Silver Lunatics.

Mr. H. H. GIBBS, ex-governor (or president) of the Bank of England, and Mr. HENRY R. GREENE, the present governor of that most celebrated bank in the world, are bimetalists. So says a telegram in yesterday's Dispatch.

And the former gentleman has said that he was confident that the United States Congress would not demonetize silver nor stop its coinage. He attributes the financial troubles of the world in a measure to the unsettled condition of the currency question in many if not all countries. He holds that bimetalism is necessary to agriculture and trade.

In Germany, too, the silverites seem to be growing rapidly in numbers.

What will the goldites say as to these most distinguished financiers in the world? When a governor and an ex-governor of the Bank of England declare that silver constitutes a necessary part of the currency of the world, they must mean something by it; and the little fellows who have been making Wall street hideous with their cries against silver ought to hide their diminished heads. But we know what these gentlemen will say—namely, that Mr. GIBBS and Mr. GREENE are British enemies of these United States and urging us on to our own ruin and to their benefit. But who will credit such an aspersion?

Pass Him Around.

The Independent Republican papers are already giving BOUTELLE the benefit of free advertising. The New York Times opens with the following "pull":

"The fiery, untamed Bouteille, of Bangor, endeavored yesterday to stir the blood of his fellow-artisans once more with the old controversy over more with the public schools. The law of Virginia already provides that they shall not be received for that purpose, and the law is constitutional."

[The Virginia issue changed the word "constitutional" to "unconstitutional." The right word was used by us.]

Speaking of the above paragraph, our Lynchburg contemporary said a few days afterwards:

"We cannot, therefore, assent to the construction which the Dispatch puts upon the decision."

On the 20th we insisted that our language as quoted was an absolutely correct statement of what had been decided by the court.

On the 22d the Virginia returned to the subject in an article more than two columns long; but as it fails to point out a single avowal of ours that is not true, we might well drop the subject. Let us examine these avowals:

1. "This decision does not attack the validity of the contract between the State and her creditors so far as the Legislature had the power to contract." Isn't that statement absolutely accurate? The Virginia did not deny that it is.

2. "The bonds issued in 1871, as well as the McCulloch bonds, are as good as ever. So are the coupons of those bonds." Isn't that statement a correct one? Will any lawyer say that those bonds or these coupons are not now as good as they were before the decision was rendered? Surely the brokers and bankers know what the decision was.

3. "The only difference is that the coupons cannot now be lawfully received for that portion of taxes levied for the support of the public schools." That is all the difference.

4. "The law of Virginia already provides that they shall not be received for that purpose, and the law is constitutional." This statement is absolutely true.

We ask our Lynchburg contemporary to "tussle" with those points. They are the ones he assailed.

Nevertheless, as the Virginia manifests an admirable spirit in its articles, we will notice one or two of its utterances. The long article which we have mentioned seems to have been written with the intention of showing that the Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia would if a case involving that question were brought before that tribunal decide the funding act of 1871 to be unconstitutional. We cannot for one moment entertain that belief. But as we said nothing on that point in the paragraph from which the Virginia dissented in its first article, and as our negative prediction would be worth just as much as, and no more than, the Virginia's affirmative prediction, we will not touch that point. We confine ourselves, and we ask the Virginia to confine itself, to the points at issue. We have no objection, however, to a "tussle" with the following:

"If, therefore, 'school taxes' are embraced in the 'all taxes, debts, and demands' mentioned in the funding bill as payable in coupons, then that part of the funding bill must, of course, be unconstitutional and void. We would like to see the Dispatch tussle with that 'contentation according,' as Tony Lumpkin would say."

We beg leave to reply that "school taxes" are embraced in the "all taxes, debts, and demands" mentioned in the funding bill as payable in coupons, then that part of the funding bill must, of course, be unconstitutional and void, not in its entirety, but so far only as it attempts to make coupons receivable for school taxes. And this last is in substance exactly what the Supreme Court of Appeals decided in the VASHON case.

We will add here that the vice of the Virginia's argument lies in the assumption that all of a law is unconstitutional if part of it is. In other words, we hold that the funding act of 1871 and the law under which VASHON's suit was defeated are both constitutional. The latter is constitutional in all its parts. The former was passed constitutional in all of its features, but in 1884 it was repealed so far as the school taxes were concerned. Coupons were receivable for "all taxes" from 1871 to 1884. In 1884 a new law was passed excepting school taxes. These are now payable only in money; but all the rest of the act of 1871 is

still in full force. There is no question of constitutionality here, Brother MAYE.

Silver Lunatics.

Mr. H. H. GIBBS, ex-governor (or president) of the Bank of England, and Mr. HENRY R. GREENE, the present governor of that most celebrated bank in the world, are bimetalists. So says a telegram in yesterday's Dispatch.

And the former gentleman has said that he was confident that the United States Congress would not demonetize silver nor stop its coinage. He attributes the financial troubles of the world in a measure to the unsettled condition of the currency question in many if not all countries. He holds that bimetalism is necessary to agriculture and trade.

In Germany, too, the silverites seem to be growing rapidly in numbers.

What will the goldites say as to these most distinguished financiers in the world? When a governor and an ex-governor of the Bank of England declare that silver constitutes a necessary part of the currency of the world, they must mean something by it; and the little fellows who have been making Wall street hideous with their cries against silver ought to hide their diminished heads. But we know what these gentlemen will say—namely, that Mr. GIBBS and Mr. GREENE are British enemies of these United States and urging us on to our own ruin and to their benefit. But who will credit such an aspersion?

Pass Him Around.

The Independent Republican papers are already giving BOUTELLE the benefit of free advertising. The New York Times opens with the following "pull":

"The fiery, untamed Bouteille, of Bangor, endeavored yesterday to stir the blood of his fellow-artisans once more with the old controversy over more with the public schools. The law of Virginia already provides that they shall not be received for that purpose, and the law is constitutional."

[The Virginia issue changed the word "constitutional" to "unconstitutional." The right word was used by us.]

Speaking of the above paragraph, our Lynchburg contemporary said a few days afterwards:

"We cannot, therefore, assent to the construction which the Dispatch puts upon the decision."

On the 20th we insisted that our language as quoted was an absolutely correct statement of what had been decided by the court.

On the 22d the Virginia returned to the subject in an article more than